

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 15, 2004, in which claims 1-10 were initially rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above-amendments and the following remarks.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booton, U.S. Patent No. 6,337,857 or Litman, U.S. Patent No. 6,053,406 and further in view of Talmor et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,540,415.

The present disclosure concerns the problem of authenticating a person that uses a mobile object. The disclosure provides a method and system for identifying a mobile object in combination with authenticating the user of the mobile object using a microphone. The method and system can therefore prevent unauthorized use of the mobile object if the mobile object is stolen by another person, for example.

Booton discloses a computer telephony integrated network, which uses a sound card implemented in a computer. The sound card is used to emit a particular ringing tone when an incoming call is received on a computer in order to enable a user to identify the computer on which the call is received. These features are useful in offices where several computers and telephone sets are installed in the same room. It avoids the user having to look for the ringing computer and/or telephone set by giving an acoustical indication.

Differentiated ringing tones are used in a very different context and particularly, not at all used in relation with a microphone. Further, these acoustical signals are not received by a microphone and are not converted into electrical signals, as required by independent claims 1 and 6.

Moreover, it is noted that the object used to emit the ring tone cannot be qualified as a mobile object.

Litman discloses an antiforgery security system where the user passes an item through a reading machine in order to send sources of information to a receiving station before being authenticated by his voice. This item can be a card. The receiving station can store a voice recognition pattern, and the voice recognition pattern can also be sent as a source of information (column 11, lines 13-23). The voice recognition pattern is used to identify a voice of a user using a telephone receiver or a voice receiver hooked up to a computer for voice data transmission (column 11, lines 29-31).

It is not correct to state, as suggested in the Office Action, that the mobile object emits short identification acoustical signals. It is even less correct to state that such signals are received by a microphone and converted into electrical signals. These features are not disclosed nor suggested in the Litman document.

Talmor discloses a voice authentication method and a related system. This method uses a remote device where a data base is implemented in order to store voice prints. Such a voice recognition message is an example of an implementation for realizing the voice recognition function of the invention.

Nevertheless, the Talmor document does not disclose or suggest any use of a mobile object in combination with voice recognition. Further, Talmor does not teach or suggest that such a mobile object could be adapted to emit acoustic signals in order that such signals are received by a microphone and converted into electrical signals.

As a result, none of the cited references teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, identification of a mobile object in combination with the authentication of the user of the mobile object using a microphone. Even if, despite

everything, it is considered that the invention is disclosed from the teachings of the three cited references, it clearly appears that it would be an improper reconstruction of the invention from the use of hindsight. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

B. Dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-10

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 7-10 dependent from independent claim 6. These claims recite further elements and limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references within the context of the independent claims. These claims are believed to be allowable with the allowance of the corresponding independent claims.

Further, claims 8-10 were not expressly addressed in the Office Action. Applicants therefore respectfully request clarification as to the status of these claims.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: David D. Brush
David D. Brush, Reg. No. 34,557
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DDB:tkj